



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,469	04/23/2001	Rodger Williams	2400-667	1931

27820 7590 07/07/2003

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.  
P.O. BOX 1287  
CARY, NC 27512

EXAMINER

SHAPIRO, JEFFERY A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3653

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

189 (245) 230

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/840,469	WILLIAMS ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jeffrey A. Shapiro	3653	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 09 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

(a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. 

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,4-9,11-21 and 28-33.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 2 and 3.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: See Continuation Sheet

Continuation of 10. Other: The terminal disclaimer, filed 6/9/03 has not been entered. See "Decision on Terminal Disclaimers Informal Form", dated 6/9/03, attached. In reference to applicant's statement about the revisit of Claims 1, 13, 14 and 20 on p. 4, paragraph 11 of section 2 of the final action of 5/7/03, Applicant is correct that paragraph does belong with paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of section 2. However, these limitations in paragraph 11 are the limitations Applicant used in the Amendment to Claim 1, found in the last two lines, and Claim 14, lines 4-7, said amendment filed 2/19/03. Applicant also states on p.3 of the instant response, filed 6/9/03, that "it is readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art that a unique IP address is not necessarily present for a given display controller. However, as pointed out in Finley, at col. 6, lines 50-62, TCP/IP (transaction control protocol) is used for communication throughout the system. IEEE standard 802.3 is mentioned as being used by Finley to allow use of the TCP/IP for messaging. This standard lists using destination addresses and source addresses. See figure 3.1 of IEEE Std 802.3ac-1998, cited in the attached form PTO-892. This standard has been adopted and used throughout industry. Therefore, one ordinarily skilled in the art would know to use a unique IP address for a display controller, based upon the disclosure of Finley et al ..



DONALD P. WALSH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TELEPHONE NUMBER 3600